## IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JAMES A. BIGGINS, §

Petitioner Below- § No. 506, 2008

Appellant, §

§ Court Below—Superior Court

v. § of the State of Delaware,

§ in and for Sussex County

STATE OF DELAWARE, 
§ C.A. No. 08M-09-012

Ş

Respondent BelowAppellee.

§

Submitted: January 16, 2009 Decided: April 7, 2009

Before STEELE, Chief Justice, JACOBS, and RIDGELY, Justices.

## ORDER

This 7<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, upon consideration of the parties' briefs and the record below, it appears to the Court that:

- (1) The appellant, James Biggins, filed this appeal from the Superior Court's order denying his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. We find no merit to Biggins' appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the Superior Court's judgment.
- (2) The record reflects that Biggins was convicted and sentenced in 1997 to a thirty-year term of incarceration. He presently is housed at the Vaughn Correctional Center. In 2008, he filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, asserting that correctional authorities had improperly transferred him from the general prison population to a maximum security housing unit in the facility.

Biggins argued that his confinement is illegal because it breached a 1982 consent

order entered into by the Department of Correction (DOC), which required the

DOC to adopt disciplinary procedures regarding classification movements. The

Superior Court denied Biggins' petition for a writ on the ground that Biggins is

legally detained pursuant to a valid commitment of the Superior Court.

We agree. In Delaware, the writ of habeas corpus provides relief on a (3)

very limited basis. Habeas relief is not available to a petitioner who is committed

on a felony, "the species whereof is plainly and fully set forth in the

commitment." Biggins' commitment is proper on its face. As we held in denying

a similar petition previously filed by Biggins, complaints relating to prison

management and/or classification decisions are not the proper subject of a habeas

corpus petition.<sup>3</sup>

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior

Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Henry duPont Ridgely

Justice

<sup>1</sup> Hall v. Carr, 692 A.2d 88 (1997).

<sup>2</sup> 10 Del. C. §6902.

<sup>3</sup> Biggins v. State, 2007 WL 2309992 (Del. Aug. 14, 2007).

2